



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,367	03/23/2004	Girish Premchandran	M61.12-0650	3953
27366	7590	12/12/2008	EXAMINER	
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			ALVESTEIFFER, STEPHEN D	
SUITE 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			2175	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244			MAIL DATE	
			12/12/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/807,367	Applicant(s) PREMCHANDRAN, GIRISH
	Examiner Stephen Alvesteffer	Art Unit 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,7-19 and 21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 2-6 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/136/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed September 15, 2008.

Claims 1, 2, and 17 are amended. Claim 20 is cancelled. Claims 1, 17, and 19 are independent. Claims 1-19 and 21 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (hereinafter Stewart), United States Patent 6,811,608.

Regarding claim 19, Stewart teaches a user interface comprising a plurality of graphical representations of user interface components, at least one graphical

representation having a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text (see Stewart Figure 12), wherein each of said plurality is associated with a control, and wherein each control is configured to be loaded exclusively and not concurrently with another control that has not been terminated (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"Using a cursor control device to move the pointer over a chosen project and clicking on the project enters the selected project in the field box 1210 and closes the list"*), and wherein each control is configured to be loaded in response to a user selection effectuated at a coordinate location within its respective graphical representation (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box"*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (6,811,608) *supra*, and Tesch et al. (hereinafter Tesch), United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0116416.

Regarding claim 1, Stewart teaches a computer implemented method for selectively loading controls, the method comprising:

displaying a graphical representation of a first user interface component having a visual appearance of a mechanism for facilitating an input of text (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"As shown in FIG. 12, attributes are entered into a plurality of field boxes using drop down lists"*);

receiving a first selection input that corresponds to the graphical representation (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box"*); and

loading a first control in response to the first selection input, the first control being associated with the graphical representation and configured to facilitate an incorporation of text into the graphical representation (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"In a conventional manner, this desired entry is inserted into the field box by using the cursor to highlight the entry. Located alongside each field box is a label indicating the nature of the trial attribute. Generally, field boxes are filled with previous new trial data. This allows a user the choice of keeping the old data or entering new data"*).

Stewart does not explicitly teach that loading the first control comprises transferring the first control from a computing device storage memory to a computing device addressable memory for execution. However, Tesch teaches memory management such that when a graphical object is selected, the object for editing the object is loaded into addressable memory (see Tesch paragraph [0014]; *"On request by the user (for example, by double -clicking on the graphics object 110 with a mouse button), the OLE server is loaded, which means that the application program required for editing the graphics object 110 is started thereby enabling the user to edit the*

graphics object 110"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to load controls only when they are first selected as taught by Tesch in the application of Stewart so that large amounts of data are not needlessly loaded into memory and never used.

Regarding claim 7, Stewart/Tesch teaches that loading a first control comprises loading a textbox control (see Stewart Figure 25 and column 25 line 13 through column 26 line 57; *"The user is then prompted to change the preparation date by clicking on the down arrow button 2534 alongside the preparation date text box 2536"*).

Regarding claim 8, Stewart/Tesch teaches that loading a first control comprises loading a combobox control (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"As shown in FIG. 12, attributes are entered into a plurality of field boxes using drop down lists"*, the drop down lists of Stewart are equivalent to comboboxes).

Regarding claim 9, Stewart/Tesch teaches that providing a graphical representation of a first user interface component comprises providing a graphical representation of a user interface that includes a plurality of user interface components including the first user interface component (see Stewart Figure 25).

Regarding claim 10, Stewart/Tesch teaches that providing a graphical representation of a user interface comprises providing a graphical representation of a listbox (see Stewart Figure 16 and column 21 line 60 through column 22 line 32; *"Clicking on a radio button for a solution type displays all of the current entries in the database for the solution type in a list box 1604 of the normal drop composition builder dialog window 1600 located to the right of the solution radio buttons 1602"*).

Regarding claim 11, Stewart/Tesch teaches that providing a graphical representation of a listbox comprises providing a graphical representation of a listbox that includes said graphical representation of the first user interface component in the form of a list item (see Stewart Figure 16).

Regarding claim 12, Stewart/Tesch teaches that providing a graphical representation of a listbox comprises providing a graphical representation of a listbox that includes said graphical representation of the first user interface component in the form of a textbox representation (see Stewart Figure 16).

Regarding claim 13, Stewart/Tesch teaches that providing a graphical representation of a listbox comprises providing a graphical representation of a listbox that includes said graphical representation of the first user interface component in the form of a combobox representation (see Stewart Figure 16).

Regarding claim 14, Stewart/Tesch teaches that providing a graphical representation of a user interface comprises providing a graphical representation of an Internet browser interface (see Stewart column 44 line 58 through column 45 line 17; *"Preferably, when a report is generated, a browser, such as Microsoft's Internet Explorer, is launched, and the report appears in the browser window"*).

Regarding claim 15, Stewart/Tesch teaches that receiving a selection input that corresponds to the graphical representation of the first user interface component comprises receiving a selection input at a coordinate location that lines up with the graphical representation of the first user interface component (see Stewart Figure 12

and column 18 lines 45-67; "*The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box*".

Regarding claim 16, Stewart/Tesch teaches providing a graphical representation comprises providing a computer-readable image format representation (see Stewart Figure 12; the controls displayed on screen are inherently graphical images).

Claims 17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (6,811,608) *supra*.

Regarding claim 17, Stewart teaches a computer implemented method for selectively loading controls, the method comprising:

first, providing a graphical representation of a user interface that contains a plurality of graphical representations of individual user interface components, each graphical representation of an individual user interface component being associated with a control (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; "*As shown in FIG. 12, attributes are entered into a plurality of field boxes using drop down lists*");

second, receiving a user input (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; "*The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box*");

third, identifying one of the graphical representations of the plurality of individual user interface components as being associated with the user input (see Stewart Figure

12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box"*);

fourth, loading a first control, the first control being associated with said one of the graphical representations (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box"*);

fifth, receiving a second user input (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 19 lines 48-67; *"Next, a user has the option of changing the gas purge field box 1228"*);

sixth, identifying one of the graphical representations of the plurality of individual user interface components as being associated with the second user input (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 19 lines 48-67; *"The gas purge field box is changed by clicking on the down arrow button 1230 located adjacent to the gas purge field box"*);

seventh, terminating the first control in response to the second user input (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"Using a cursor control device to move the pointer over a chosen project and clicking on the project enters the selected project in the field box 1210 and closes the list"*);

eighth, loading a second control in response to the second user input, the second control being associated with said one of the graphical representations associated with the second user input (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 19 lines 48-67; *"Clicking on the down arrow button 1230 opens a drop down list of the available purge gases"*); and

wherein first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth respectively correspond to the consecutive order of the computer implemented method for selectively loading controls.

Stewart does not explicitly teach what happens when a user opens a list of a first control, then without selecting any item, immediately clicks on the drop-down arrow of a second control. However, it is standard behavior known in the art for the list of the first control to immediately close and the list for the second control to open when this happens. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the application this way, so that a user cannot open every list and clutter the interface.

Regarding claim 18, Stewart teaches that identifying said one of the plurality comprises determining which of the plurality contains a coordinate location associated with the user input (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"The related drop down list is opened by clicking on the down button alongside the attribute field box"*).

Regarding claim 21, Stewart teaches receiving a data input that corresponds to said first control (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"Using a cursor control device to move the pointer over a chosen project and clicking on the project enters the selected project in the field box 1210 and closes the list"*); rendering a representation of the data input as part of the graphical representation identified as being associated with the user input, wherein rendering occurs prior to said terminating the first control (see Stewart Figure 12 and column 18 lines 45-67; *"Using a cursor*

control device to move the pointer over a chosen project and clicking on the project enters the selected project in the field box 1210 and closes the list").

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant asserts that Stewart does not teach that receiving the second user input happens before terminating the first control. However, as addressed in the rejection above, it is standard behavior known in the art for the list of the first control to immediately close and the list for the second control to open when this happens. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the application this way, so that a user cannot open every list and clutter the interface.

Applicant asserts that Stewart does not teach wherein each control is configured to be loaded exclusively and not concurrently with another control that has not been terminated. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant cites Stewart column 89 lines 50-51, “[I]f desired, multiple trial observations sessions from multiple trials can be opened simultaneously and displayed”. However, this is regarding to opening several windows to be displayed

simultaneously, **not** opening several lists from combobox controls to be displayed simultaneously.

Applicant also cites Stewart column 6 lines 57-59, “[a]lso, preferably, the software allows multiple users to be networked to others via a local access network (LAN) that allows simultaneous access”. However, this portion is regarding accessing the data in completely different instances of the graphical user interface in completely different locations.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571)270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2175

/S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/Kieu D Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2175